arXiv:0904.3412v2 [hep-th] 12 Apr 2010

Horava-Lifshitz gravity, absolute time, and objective particles in curved space

Hrvoje Nikolić
Theoretical Physics Division, Rudjer Bošković Institute,
P.O.B. 180, HR-10002 Zagreb, Croatia
hrvoje@thphys.irb.hr

April 13, 2010

Abstract

Recently, Horava formulated a renormalizable theory of quantum gravity that reduces to general relativity at large distances but violates Lorentz invariance at small distances. The absolute time involved in this theory allows to define an objective notion of particles associated with quantization of fields in classical gravitational backgrounds. The Unruh effect and other observer-dependent notions of particles in curved space are interpreted as effects caused by interaction between the objective vacuum and the measuring apparatus made up of objective particles.

1 Introduction

Recently, Horava [1] (influenced by old ideas of Lifshitz [2] on phase transitions in condensed-matter physics) formulated a new field theory of gravity that reduces to general relativity at large distances. However, at small distances this theory violates Lorentz invariance, in such a way that the corresponding quantum theory of gravity becomes renormalizable. Owing to these remarkable properties, this Horava-Lifshitz theory of gravity is receiving a considerable attention [3]-[57], both in the quantum and classical regime.

In this paper, we discuss some implications of the Horava-Lifshitz theory on semi-classical gravity, i.e., on the regime in which matter fields are quantized while gravity is treated as a classical background. More precisely, we discuss how the absence of the Lorentz invariance in Horava-Lifshitz theory helps to solve the old problem [58] of defining particles in classical gravitational backgrounds. (For an explicit calculation of Hawking radiation in Horava-Lifshitz gravity see [59].) The next section is a brief overview of the problem of particles in curved spacetime from the standard point of view, while the discussion of the same problem from the point of view of Horava-Lifshitz theory is presented in Sec. 3.

2 The problem of particles in curved spacetime

The problem can be formulated as follows [60]. A scalar field operator $\phi(x)$ satisfying the Klein-Gordon equation in curved spacetime (with the signature $(-,+,+,+)$)

$$[\nabla^\mu \nabla_\mu - m^2]\phi(x) = 0 \tag{1}$$

can be expanded as

$$\phi(x) = \sum_k a_k f_k(x) + a_k^\dagger f_k^*(x), \tag{2}$$

where $\{f_k(x), f_k^*(x)\}$ constitute a complete and orthogonal basis of the classical solutions of the Klein-Gordon equation, while $a_k, a_k^\dagger$ are operators satisfying the commutation relations

$$[a_k, a_{k'}] = [a_k^\dagger, a_{k'}^\dagger] = 0, \quad [a_k, a_{k'}^\dagger] = \delta_{k,k'}. \tag{3}$$

The commutation relations (3) suggest the particle interpretation, according to which the vacuum $|0\rangle$ satisfies

$$a_k|0\rangle = 0, \tag{4}$$

while n-particle states are defined by acting n times with the creation operators $a_k^\dagger$ on the vacuum. The problem is that the basis $\{f_k(x), f_k^*(x)\}$ can be introduced in many different ways, which leads to many different definitions of particles. The different definitions of particles are not equivalent, in the sense that the number of particles in a given quantum state depends on this definition. In particular, the vacuum defined with respect to one definition of particles may be a many-particle state with respect to another definition of particles [60]. In Minkowski spacetime the particles can be defined with respect to the basis in which the functions $f_k(x)$ have a positive frequency. However, the notion of frequency depends on the choice of the time coordinate. On the other hand, the principle of covariance with respect to arbitrary spacetime coordinate transformations, which plays a crucial role in general relativity, implies that there is no any natural choice of the time coordinate. Consequently, there is no any natural definition of particles either.

To overcome this problem, one possibility is to adopt the point of view according to which particles do not play any fundamental role in quantum field theory in curved spacetime [60, 61]. However, such a point of view does not seem to be completely satisfying because almost everything that we observe in high energy experiments seems to be defined in terms of particles. Another possibility is to interpret the concept of particle as an observer dependent entity, because each observer may have his own natural definition of time. However, such a definition of particles seems to be somewhat vague because the concept of an observer is not well defined in physical terms. Moreover, in a transition from one observer to another the concept of particles does not transform in a covariant manner. Consequently, as stressed in [62], it is not clear which definition of particles, if any, corresponds to the particles that contribute to the covariantly transforming energy-momentum tensor that determines the gravitational field.

3 Particles in Horava-Lifshitz gravitational background

Now, from the point of view of Horava-Lifshitz theory of gravity, the problem of particles takes a completely different flavor. The Horava-Lifshitz theory of gravity is not covariant with respect to arbitrary spacetime coordinate transformations. The fundamental fields that describe gravity are the spacial metric $g_{ij}(\mathbf{x},t)$, the lapse function $N(\mathbf{x},t)$, and the shift vector $N_i(\mathbf{x},t)$, where $i,j=1,2,3$ and $\mathbf{x}=\{x^1,x^2,x^3\}$. Here we do not need the explicit form of the action $S[g_{ij},N,N_i]$ because we treat $g_{ij}(\mathbf{x},t)$, $N(\mathbf{x},t)$, $N_i(\mathbf{x},t)$ as a fixed non-dynamical background. It suffices to say that the action [1] is covariant with respect to coordinate transformations that do *not* mix space coordinates x^i with the time coordinate t. However, the action is not covariant with respect to coordinate transformations that do mix space and time coordinates. Such a time-space mixing covariance appears only in the low energy limit. The fundamental fields N, N_i define the components of an effective spacetime metric through the Arnowitt-Deser-Misner relations

$$N=(-g^{00})^{-1/2}, \quad N_i=g_{0i}, \tag{5}$$

but due to the lack of general spacetime coordinate invariance, the notion of spacetime does not longer play any fundamental role. Instead, space and time are fundamentally independent entities. In particular, time is absolute (up to a trivial rescaling of the form $t'=f(t)$). By having an absolute notion of time, one can also define an objective notion of particles, as particles defined with respect to functions $f_k(\mathbf{x},t)$ which have a positive frequency with respect to the absolute time t.

Even though the particles in quantum field theory now have an objective status, it does not mean that the number of particles cannot change with time. Indeed, when the gravitational background is time dependent, one expects particle creation [60]. The particle creation can be calculated in an exactly the same way as in the conventional approach with a fixed gravitational background [60], provided that the correct time coordinate has been identified. For example, the standard derivation of Hawking radiation [60, 63] is based on the assumption that the particles outside the horizon are defined with respect to the Schwarzschild time. If this identification of time is the correct one from the point of view of Horava-Lifshitz theory, then these Hawking particles are objective. Indeed, as shown in [56, 57], the classical spherically-symmetric solution

$$ds^2=-N^2(r)dt^2+\frac{dr^2}{f(r)}+r^2(d\theta^2+\sin^2\theta\, d\varphi^2) \tag{6}$$

of Horava-Lifshitz theory in the limit of vanishing cosmological constant reads

$$N^2(r)=f(r)=1+\omega r^2-\sqrt{r(\omega^2 r^3+4\omega M)}, \tag{7}$$

where ω is a free parameter of the theory. For large r it reduces to

$$f(r)\approx 1-\frac{2M}{r}+\mathcal{O}(r^{-4}), \tag{8}$$

which corresponds to the Schwarzschild metric. The exact metric (7) contains two horizons at

$$r_\pm = M\left(1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{2\omega M^2}}\right). \tag{9}$$

Assuming that $M^2 \gg \omega^{-1}$, the outer horizon $r_+ \approx 2M$ is close to the Schwarzschild horizon, while the inner horizon $r_- \approx 0$ is close to the singularity. Since we are not allowed to transform (6) to other spacetime coordinates by coordinate transformations that mix r and t, this shows that the Schwarzschild time is indeed the preferred time of the black hole and that the singularity on the horizon is not merely a coordinate singularity. This means that, contrary to the usual interpretation of Hawking radiation, all observers should agree that the black hole radiates, including the freely falling observers near the horizon. (We also point out that even the notion of an event horizon does not play the usual role in Horava-Lifshitz gravity [1] because the absence of Lorentz invariance implies that information can travel even faster than light, allowing information to escape from the horizon. However, it does not seem to affect the creation of Hawking radiation, because only the existence of an apparent horizon is essential for Hawking mechanism of particle creation [64].) We also note that with an absolute notion of time, the particles in a gravitational background can also be defined locally in terms of local particle currents that are not conserved at the points at which the particle creation takes place [65, 66, 67].

Now, if particles in a gravitational background are objective entities, then how to interpret the Unruh effect [62, 60]? The Unruh effect is a statement that the Minkowski vacuum appears as a thermal state with an indefinite number of particles when viewed by a uniformly accelerated observer. There are two approaches how the Unruh effect can be derived [60]. The first approach is to define the particles with respect to time of an accelerated observer, leading to the notion of Rindler particles. The second approach is to define the particles with respect to the Minkowski time, but to study a response of an accelerated detector. The Minkowski spacetime is a solution of Horava-Lifshitz theory, which corresponds to $M = 0$ in (7). Again, we are not allowed to transform this solution to Rindler coordinates, because such a coordinate transformation would mix time and space coordinates. Consequently, the objective particles in a flat Horava-Lifshitz background are the Minkowski particles so only the second approach above is the correct one. Indeed, it has been already shown that the two approaches are not equivalent [68, 69], so it is impossible that both approaches are correct.

The Unruh effect and its generalizations in various gravitational backgrounds can be more generally understood as follows. The vacuum (i.e., the state without objective particles) can be expanded as

$$|0\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\xi_n} c_{n,\xi_n} |n, \xi_n\rangle' \tag{10}$$

where c_{n,ξ_n} are some coefficients of the expansion and $|n, \xi_n\rangle'$ are "n-particle" states defined with respect to some other time coordinate corresponding to a spacetime coordinate transformation with respect to which the Horava-Lifshitz gravity is not

covariant. The parameter ξ_n parameterizes different states with the same "number of particles" n. For $n = 0$, ξ_n takes only one possible value, i.e., $|0, \xi_0\rangle' \equiv |0\rangle'$. The quantity $|c_{n,\xi_n}|^2$ is the probability that the system will be found in the state $|n, \xi_n\rangle'$, but it does not have any operational meaning without having a physical interpretation of $|n, \xi_n\rangle'$. In fact, the state (10) receives an operational meaning only if it becomes entangled with a macroscopic measuring apparatus, or more generally, with a macroscopic environment. If the total state describing the entanglement with the environment takes the form

$$|\Psi\rangle_{\text{total}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\xi_n} c_{n,\xi_n} |n, \xi_n\rangle' |E_{n,\xi_n}\rangle, \tag{11}$$

where $|E_{n,\xi_n}\rangle$ are macroscopically distinct states of the environment (measuring apparatus) describing a large number of objective particles, then $|c_{n,\xi_n}|^2$ is the probability that the environment will be found in the state $|E_{n,\xi_n}\rangle$. If the environment is found in the state $|E_{n,\xi_n}\rangle$, then it is justified to say that the measured system described by (10) is found in the state $|n, \xi_n\rangle'$. When the environment is accelerated or when a gravitational background is present, the theory of decoherence can explain why the interaction with the environment leads to an entanglement of the form of (11) [70, 71, 72], with $|n, \xi_n\rangle'$ being the "n-particle" states defined with respect to the proper time of the environment. In particular, if the environment is found in the state $|E_0\rangle$, then the measured system is in the state $|0\rangle'$. This state is actually a squeezed state [73], containing an uncertain number of objective particles with an average number of objective particles being larger than zero. Thus, the interaction with the environment creates new objective particles, even when the measurement apparatus is found in the state $|E_0\rangle$.

To conclude, we have seen that the Horava-Lifshitz theory of gravity significantly reinterprets the old problem of particles associated with quantum fields in gravitational backgrounds. The absolute time of the Horava-Lifshitz gravity suggests that particles in quantum field theory retain their objective status, similarly to the more familiar concept of particles associated with quantum fields in Minkowski spacetime.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Ministry of Science of the Republic of Croatia under Contract No. 098-0982930-2864.

References

[1] P. Horava, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 084008 (2009) [arXiv:0901.3775].

[2] E.M. Lifshitz, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **11**, 255 (1941).

[3] P. Horava, JHEP **0903**, 020 (2009) [arXiv:0812.4287].

[4] M. Visser, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 025011 (2009) [arXiv:0902.0590].

[5] P. Horava, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 161301 (2009) [arXiv:0902.3657].

[6] T. Takahashi, J. Soda, arXiv:0904.0554.

[7] G. Calcagni, arXiv:0904.0829.

[8] E. Kiritsis, G. Kofinas, arXiv:0904.1334.

[9] J. Kluson, arXiv:0904.1343.

[10] H. Lu, J. Mei, C.N. Pope, arXiv:0904.1595.

[11] S. Mukohyama, arXiv:0904.2190.

[12] R. Brandenberger, arXiv:0904.2835.

[13] K.-I. Izawa, arXiv:0904.3593.

[14] H. Nastase, arXiv:0904.3604.

[15] R.-G. Cai, Y. Liu, Y.-W. Sun, arXiv:0904.4104.

[16] Y.-S. Piao, arXiv:0904.4117.

[17] X. Gao, arXiv:0904.4187.

[18] E.O. Colgain, H. Yavartanoo, arXiv:0904.4357.

[19] S. Mukohyama, K. Nakayama, F. Takahashi, S. Yokoyama, arXiv:0905.0055.

[20] Y.S. Myung, Y.-W. Kim, arXiv:0905.0179.

[21] R.-G. Cai, B. Hu, H.-B. Zhang, arXiv:0905.0255.

[22] C. Gao, arXiv:0905.0310.

[23] R.-G. Cai, L.-M. Cao, N. Ohta, arXiv:0905.0751.

[24] A. Ghodsi, arXiv:0905.0836.

[25] S. Chen, J. Jing, arXiv:0905.1409.

[26] R.A. Konoplya, arXiv:0905.1523.

[27] S. Chen, J. Jing, arXiv:0905.2055.

[28] B. Chen, S. Pi, J.-Z. Tang, arXiv:0905.2300.

[29] C. Charmousis, G. Niz, A. Padilla, P.M. Saffin, arXiv:0905.2579.

[30] T. P. Sotiriou, M. Visser, S. Weinfurtner, arXiv:0905.2798.

[31] Y.-W. Kim, H.W. Lee, Y.S. Myung, arXiv:0905.3423.

[32] S. Mukohyama, arXiv:0905.3563.

[33] G. Calcagni, arXiv:0905.3740.

[34] A. Wang, Y. Wu, arXiv:0905.4117.

[35] S. Nojiri, S.D. Odintsov, arXiv:0905.4213.

[36] M. Sakamoto, arXiv:0905.4326.

[37] M. Botta-Cantcheff, N. Grandi, M. Sturla, arXiv:0906.0582.

[38] Y.S. Myung, arXiv:0906.0848.

[39] A. Ghodsi, E. Hatefi, arXiv:0906.1237.

[40] F.-W. Shu, Y.-S. Wu, arXiv:0906.1645.

[41] Y. Kawamura, arXiv:0906.3773.

[42] S. Mukohyama, arXiv:0906.5069.

[43] A. Wang, R. Maartens, arXiv:0907.1748.

[44] S.-S. Kim, T. Kim, Y. Kim, arXiv:0907.3093.

[45] C. Appignani, R. Casadio, S. Shankaranarayanan, arXiv:0907.3121.

[46] H.W. Lee, Y.-W. Kim, Y.S. Myung, arXiv:0907.3568.

[47] Y.S. Myung, Phys. Lett. B **679**, 491 (2009).

[48] S.K. Chakrabarti, E.N. Saridakis, A.A. Sen, arXiv:0908.0293.

[49] T. Kobayashi, Y. Urakawa, M. Yamagichi, JCAP **0911**, 015 (2009).

[50] Y.S. Myung, Phys. Lett. B **681**, 81 (2009).

[51] C. Ding, S. Chen, J. Jing, arXiv:0909.2490.

[52] P. Wu, H.-W. Yu, arXiv:0909.2821.

[53] A. Wang, D. Wands, R. Maartens, arXiv:0909.5167.

[54] J. Greewald, A. Papazoglou, A. Wang, arXiv:0912.0011.

[55] R. Garattini, arXiv:0912.0136.

[56] A. Kehagias, K. Sfetsos, Phys. Lett. B **678**, 123 (2009) [arXiv:0905.0477].

[57] Y.S. Myung, Phys. Lett. B **678**, 127 (2009) [arXiv:0905.0957].

[58] S.A. Fulling, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 2850 (1973).

[59] D.-Y. Chen, H. Yang and X.-T. Zu, Phys. Lett. B **681**, 463 (2009).

[60] N.D. Birrell, P.C.W. Davies, Quantum Fields in Curved Space (Cambridge Press, New York, 1982).

[61] R.M. Wald, Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime and Black Hole Thermodynamics (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1994).

[62] W.G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D **14**, 870 (1976).

[63] S. Hawking, Commun. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975).

[64] M. Visser, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **12**, 649 (2003).

[65] H. Nikolić, Phys. Lett. B **527**, 119 (2002).

[66] H. Nikolić, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **12**, 407 (2003).

[67] H. Nikolić, Gen. Rel. Grav. **37**, 297 (2005).

[68] H. Nikolić, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **16**, 579 (2001).

[69] L. Sriramkumar, T. Padmanabhan, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **11**, 1 (2002).

[70] B. L. Hu, A. Matacz, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 6612 (1994).

[71] J. Audretsch, M. Mensky, R. Müller, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 1716 (1995).

[72] P. Kok, U. Yurtsever, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 085006 (2003).

[73] L.P. Grishchuk, Y.V. Sidorov, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 3413 (1990).